United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/618,711	07/15/2003	Hideki Kobayashi	Q76339	4933
23373 SUGHRUE MI	10/618,711 07/15/2003 Hideki Kobayashi	EXAMINER		
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.			GOMA, TAWFIK A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2627	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/13/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/618,711	KOBAYASHI, HIDEKI			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Tawfik Goma	2627			
The MAILING DATE of this communication apperiod for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLEWHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING I. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC .136(a). In no event, however, may a re d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT te, cause the application to become ABA	ATION. ply be timely filed HS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05</u> .	<u>June 2007</u> .	•			
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ Th	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D.	11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims	•				
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) 3,4,7 and 8 is/are w 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-2 and 5-6 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	rithdrawn from consideration	•			
Application Papers					
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examir	ner.				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac		y the Examiner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	e drawing(s) be held in abeyand	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre	ction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	Examiner. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documer 2. Certified copies of the priority documer 3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri application from the International Bure: * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Apority documents have been a au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	oplication No received in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)					
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	Paper No(s	ummary (PTO-413) //Mail Date formal Patent Application 			

Application/Control Number: 10/618,711

Art Unit: 2627

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to the amendment filed on 6/5/2007.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2 and 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muramatsu et al (US 5177729) in view of Kuwabara (US 557644) and further in view of Maegawa et al (US 6345018).

Regarding claim 1, Muramatsu discloses an information recording/reproducing apparatus for reproducing comprising: a demodulator for performing a demodulation processing on a read signal read from said recording medium corresponding to each of the modulation schemes to generate a data signal for each demodulation processing (7, fig. 1 and 8 fig. 1); an error corrector for performing error correction processing on each of the data signals to generate a corrected data signal corresponding to each of the data signals (11, 12, fig. 1); and an output part for selectively outputting the corrected data signal corresponding to the data signal having the lowest error ratio among the data signals as a reproduced data (13, fig. 1). Muramatsu fails to disclose wherein the data signal is demodulated using different modulation schemes. In the same field of endeavor, Kuwabara discloses demodulating data with different demodulating schemes (4, 6 fig. 4 and col. 8 lines 57-67 through col. 9 lines 1-8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the

Art Unit: 2627

recording apparatus disclosed by Muramatsu with the address demodulators that correspond to different modulation schemes as taught by Kuwabara. The rationale is as follows: One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated reproduce data with demodulator's that correspond to modulation schemes of the recorded data in order to select the correct demodulating scheme for data that is modulated with multiple modulations schemes quickly (see Kuwabara col. 1 lines 33-38).

Further in regard to claim 1, Muramatsu in view of Kuwabara fail to disclose wherein the data signal is address data. In the same field of endeavor, Maegawa discloses the use of different modulation schemes to modulate address data (col. 1 lines 25-38). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the device disclosed by Muramatsu and Kuwabara to address data as it would have been a known technique that is used to improve the selection of a modulation scheme quickly during reproduction of data.

Regarding claim 2, Muramatsu further discloses an information recording/reproducing apparatus according further comprising: an error detector for performing error detection processing on each of the data signals to generate an error detection result signal including an error ratio of each of said data signals (col. 3 lines 61-66), and information indicating whether or not each of the data signals can be corrected by said error corrector (EP pointer information, col. 3 lines 65-67 thru col. 4 lines 1-7), wherein said an output part includes: a determining part for determining based on the error detection result signal an data signal which is correctable and has the lowest error ratio from said address data signals (col. 4 lines 12-16 and 13, fig. 1); and a selector for selecting a corrected data signal corresponding to the address data signal determined by said determining part from said corrected data signals to output the corrected address data

Art Unit: 2627

signal selected thereby as the reproduced data (13, fig. 1, fig. 4 and col. 3 lines 66-68 thru col. 8 lines 1-7 and col. 4 lines 12-15). It would have been obvious for the data to be address data as taught by Maegawa for the same reasons as in claim 1.

Method claims 5 and 6 are drawn to the method of using the corresponding apparatus claimed in claims 1 and 2. Therefore method claims 5 and 6 correspond to apparatus claims 1 and 2 and are rejected for the same reasons of obviousness applied above.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-2 and 5-6 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tawfik Goma whose telephone number is (571) 272-4206. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Korzuch can be reached on (571) 272-7589. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/618,711 Page 5

Art Unit: 2627

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Tawfik Goma/ 8/28/2007

/William R. Korzuch/

SPE, Art Unit 2627